

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/418,119	10/14/1999	ANGSHUMAN SAHA	239604	8445
	7590 11/14/2007	EXAMINER		
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC 3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D			VO, DON NGUYEN	
WATSONVIL	WATSONVILLE, CA 95076		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<u> </u>		114			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/418,119	SAHA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	DON N. VO	2611			
The MAILING DATE of this communication of Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI atute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	1 August 2007.	·			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ T	a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 17-22 and 31-36 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 17-22 and 31-36 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	drawn from consideration.	·			
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner			
Applicant may not request that any objection to					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum. 2. Certified copies of the priority docum. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur. * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have beer eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage			
		·			
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🖂 Intanzawa	Summary (PTO-413)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Dottice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No	s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application			
•					

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 8/24/2007.

Accordingly, claims 17-22 and 31-36 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation of claim 32 is vaque and indefinite because when taking the combination of claims 31 and 32 together, it is unclear of how the limitation of "except for ... data packet" recited in claim 31, lines 5-7 is to be carried out since there is now only one bad control word to determine becoming unsynchronized. That is, how the synchronized data packet can separate one bad control word? Similar problem exists for the recitation of claim 35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States Application/Control Number: 09/418,119 Page 3

Art Unit: 2611

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 17-22 and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashemi et al (US 6,064,679).

Regarding claims 17-22, Hashemi, as shown in figure 3, teaches a method for word synchronization between the plurality of word devices (300) connected by serial lines (310) comprising requesting synchronization when the word device (300) is inserted into the hub loop and performing the synchronization process so that the newly connected word device (300) can communicate with other word devices (300) in the hub loop. See also column 5, line 25 to column 7, line 7.

Regarding claims 31-36, Hashemi also teaches detecting loss of word synchronization whenever there are a number of bad control words being received. See column 7, lines 7-14.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-22 and 31-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References Gindi (US 4,042,783) and Henson et al (US

Application/Control Number: 09/418,119

Art Unit: 2611

6,157,652) are cited because they are pertinent to the method of word synchronization

Page 4

and detecting loss of synchronization.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DON N. VO whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:00AM - 6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MOHAMMAD GHAYOUR can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DON N. VO

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2611